DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 134 529 SO 009 786

AUTHOR Brown, Richard H.
TITLE Opportunities for Wider Use of Archival and Manuscript Repositories.
PUB DATE Jan 77
NOTE 13p.; Paper presented at Conference on Funding Priorities of the Society of American Archivists (Chicago, Illinois, January 6-8, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Archives; *Curriculum Development; Educational Facilities; *Educational Resources; *Educational Trends; Higher Education; Information Sources; *Library Collections; Primary Sources; Questioning Techniques; Secondary Education; Student Research; Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

In light of changing trends in education since the 1960s, archives and manuscript collections are becoming more useful as primary educational resources on both secondary and higher education levels. One reason for this is the recent emphasis on inquiry learning with the subsequent development of collections of evidence, data, and documents for students to investigate. Another reason involves the movement of education beyond the formal classroom into the community. Experiential education allows students to come to repositories of educational materials; the materials no longer must be packaged and sent to the schools. The author discusses four ways in which archives and manuscript collections could be used as dynamic resources. As sources of curriculum materials, collections could be selected and packaged according to media type, such as microfilm resource units, or subject areas, such as ethnic or community history. Training programs and institutes could be developed for teachers to learn how to use collections not only for research but also for teaching. Seminars could be offered to students using specific subject-matter collections as the basis for course outlines. Because the research role of archives goes hand in hand with its development as an educational institution, archive collections may expand into further research endeavors as further educational programs are offered. (AV)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

Paper delivered at Conference on Funding Priorities, Society of American Archivists; Chicago, Illinois, January 6-8, 1977.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

OPPORTUNITIES FOR WIDER USE OF ARCHIVAL AND MANUSCRIPT REPOSITORIE

Richard H. Brown
The Newberry Library

ED134529

It is a truism that needs no repeating that American education has seen profound changes in the last decade and a half. These changes have resulted from altered views of how people learn, where they learn, and what they might most profitably study. The changes have led to the development of new types of educational institutions, to bold alterations in existing institutions, and to awareness of new possibilities in functional link-ups between different kinds of institutions. They have significant implications for those of us who deal with archives and manuscript collections, and who represent institutions that were once thought to be at least several steps removed from education as such. They challenge the traditional narrow view of the function of these institutions, and offer rich opportunities to all of us for expanded public service.

The most significant changes, for our purposes, are easy to recount. The decade of the sixties saw, as you may recall, extensive and intensive attempts to revive, alter, and implement an old theory of how people learn and of what is most useful to learn that traced back to John Dewey: this was the idea that the first goal of education should be to learn how to learn, in order to be able to go on learning long after today's facts are out-of-date or no longer serviceable. Related to this was the idea that one learned best when learning from experience: that if one was to learn to be an inquirer one had to practice inquiry; that the most useful curricula was therefore curricula that asked students not to master other people's facts willy-nilly but rather to ask questions

SP009786

and pursue them through evidence, reaching their own conclusions and developing their own new questions.

In effect, the most effective curricula were held to be those that asked the student to play the active role of the scholar rather than the passive role of the empty vessel into which knowledge would be poured. The model of the scholar learning was seen as the most effective model for the classroom--not that we wanted to train all students to be professional scholars, God forbid, but because the scholar's business was learning; in pursuing it he sharpened intellectual and critical faculties and increased his sensitivity to new knowledge and new phenomena; and these were the skills we wanted students to learn and the habits we wanted them to develop. Corollary to this was the sense that the scholar, as independent inquirer, had fun at his task. We wanted students to share the excitement and the adventure of learning, in order to motivate them to be lifetime learners.

In history and the social studies, as in the other disciplines, these ideas led to a spate of curriculum development projects which had as their principal aim the development of new materials which would make it possible for the student to act as inquirer--or, if you will, as scholar. The Amherst Project was the only one of these projects that worked exclusively in history; there were a host of others as well in other disiplines and in the social studies broadly. The materials we all developed were not texts giving answers, but collections of evidence, data, and documents to which the student could bring his questions. We were, in short, packaging libraries and archives--inert research materials--for export to the classroom.

The materials were developed in different ways, some by professional curriculum developers, some by teachers, and by the late sixties, some by students themselves. They included written, visual, and tactile evidence, and took different forms. These included the English Jackdaw materials--facsimiles of evidence which gave the student the excitement of dealing with reproductions of original evidence that were hard to package. Others were more highly structured, and included, in the United States, not only the Amherst Project material but the Holt Social Studies Curricula and the famous "Man, A Course of Study," produced by the Educational Development Center in Cambridge.

It was but a short step from these ideas of curriculum and of what students should be doing to the breakdown of classroom and school walls--not only figuratively but almost literally in the late sixties. If students were held to learn best not as a result of something done to them in classrooms, but as a result of their attempts to pursue their own questions, why should they not pursue these questions outside the classroom and outside the school, into and through the evidence available to them in their daily lives and in the community around them? Out of this has come the vogue of "experiential" or community-based education--education outside of school and through participation in community activities--which is still very much with us. In a host of alternative "campus free" degree programs, formal education is no longer seen as taking place exclusively in classrooms. Implicit in this for the study of history is the idea that we no longer have to take libraries and archives to the students, but that we can and should instead take the students to the libraries and the archives.

If we have altered some of our views of how people learn and where it is appropriate for them to learn, we are changing also, very rapidly, our view of what is appropriate for people to study. It is no accident that the most vital areas of history study at virtually every level of American education today are studies of the family, of communities, and of local institutions. Students are learning most effectively--and most excitedly--where they are "doing" history for themselves. If students learn best by pursuing answers to their own questions, why should those questions not begin with matters of most obvious interest for the student, for the investigation of which he or she already possesses a context? And why should these inquiries not begin also with types of evidence or "media" with which the student is most familiar in his or her own life: family letters and scrapbooks, talks with grandparents, files of school yearbooks and local newspapers, artifacts of all kinds (including old homes), photographs through time of familiar scenes?

Ranging from the famous "Foxfire" projects for junior high and even elementary students to the most advanced work at the graduate level--and including lay people doing increasingly sophisticated work in genealogy and community history--learners are increasingly developing a genuine historical consciousness and effective skills of inquiry through piecing together the saga of families, the history of schools, neighborhoods, and local businesses, the story of athletic teams and cultural institutions. They are, in short, beginning to use archives, formal and informal, to learn; and they suggest an important new constituency, and important new opportunities for service, for archival and manuscript repositories.

So much for background. What then are some of the new uses we can make

of archives and manuscript collections, how can we capitalize on them, and what are some of the problems attendant on doing so? Obviously these vary from institution to institution, depending on a host of factors such as size, constituency, location, definition of purpose, and the nature, quality, legal status, and condition of its collections. Let me list some possibilities, in what is essentially an ascending order of complexity, and of significance:

1. Archives and manuscript collections as sources of curriculum materials. The new styles of teaching and learning, and new interests in particular types of history study, have produced a need and market for packaged archive and manuscript collections at virtually every level of American education. We need projects to provide these. Obviously most of these collections will involve selections of material. Some collections may be structured, as were the Amherst units, to a greater or lesser degree, in which case a curriculum specialist had better be among the assemblers. Others will be unstructured material out of which students bring their own order. Some will best take printed form and be designed as classroom sets; others might be packaged on microfilm, microfiche, or tape and be designed as resource units to which individual students go. A variety of subject areas will find a current market, particularly those having to do with social and ethnic history, with changes in the way society functions, and with changes in sex and economic roles. Collections having to do with family and community history will be most successful to the degree that they serve as generic models, against which students can measure comparatively changes in their own families and communities in the same time periods.

Projects to prepare collections of this type would generally be relatively low-cost, requiring chiefly the time of specialists to select, edit, and arrange or structure the materials--in short, development time. Production and dissemination, whether by commercial or non-commercial routes, will ordinarily pay for itself through sale of the materials.

2. Archive and Manuscript Repositories as a new source of teaching and learning styles. We need projects to bring teachers at all levels to archive and manuscript collections to learn how to use these collections, not only for research but for teaching. These might range from summer institutes of 6-8 weeks duration to after-school and Saturday in-service training programs. They might also involve fellowships for teachers preparing curriculum materials for classroom use. We have at the Newberry Library two such programs, which may be suggestive. One is a six week summer institute for secondary school teachers and curriculum supervisors in our Center for the History of the American Indian. Teachers participate in a reading seminar in Indian history and, in the afternoons, use the Newberry's rich Indian history collection to develop teaching materials for their own students. These materials are tried out in classrooms during the following academic year, and five teachers whose materials seem most promising are invited back a second summer to polish the materials for publication. A second program is offered to college and university faculty by our Family and Community History Center. Designed to improve the teaching of state and community history, the program includes an annual national conference designed to enable people to share new approaches in the field, followed by 3-6 month fellowships for approximately ten historians a year who stay on at the Newberry to work in our collections, and with each other, on new curricular materials.

Important in the projects we need will be belated recognition of a number of things: (a) that teachers who are guiding students in research-based learning need to have had experience doing research themselves--this experience has never been a part of teacher training programs as such, and teachers, particularly below the college level, have had such experience only accidentally if at all; (b) that the best place for teachers to get a research experience is in a research institution, working with the type of materials that their students will subsequently be using; (c) that teachers themselves, once acquainted with the use of archives and manuscripts, will frequently be the best developers of curriculum materials that emanate from these sources because they are sensitive to student reaction and to how their students will approach particular research tasks; (d) that, correspondingly, working on curriculum naterials can be an enormously valuable teacher training experience, challenging teachers to analyze factors that encourage and discourage student learning and to plan more effective experiences for students in their own classrooms. Clearly the most effective way of using archival and manuscript collections to train teachers is to set the teachers to the task of developing curriculum materials for their own students. The projects we need, particularly, are those that will do this.

Projects to bring teachers to archives may range from simple low-cost operations to more elaborate programs, depending, obviously, on length and size of the project, the degree to which the project gets involved in the development of curriculum materials, and the question of whether follow-up assistance is provided teachers when they return to their classrooms. At a minimum such projects require fellowships or other stipendiary aid for teacher participants. They may also require some

staffing from outside the host institution: they require as leader a person who is not only trained in archival research but who has experience, as well, in using the research mode in classrooms. If materials are to be developed projects will need, as well, a good curriculum specialist, and depending on their complexity they may need professional help in editing and in handling non-print media. Finally, projects are likely to be particularly effective if they provide regular follow-up support for teachers using new approaches once they return to their classrooms. Examples of this include provision for staff help to teachers when they return to the archives, perhaps with their students; systematic review and evaluation of field experience with materials developed in the project; and provision for news exchanges among teachers adapting new approaches to their own classrooms.

3. The Archive as an Educational Institution. If there is opportunity for projects to bring teachers to archive and manuscript repositories, we have the opportunity also to develop seminars and other programs that will bring students themselves to the repositories. The first of these uses the repository as a source for new teaching and learning styles; the second turns it (at least partially) into an educational institution. If modern educators are finding archival research a useful way for students to learn, why should we not find ways to make it possible for them to learn in our archives? We shall want to do so, of course, in ways that are consistent with the need to preserve the collections for future uses as well. Some collections will obviously need to be restricted to the very few; others will bear heavier use; still others will need to be reproduced, at least in part, if widespread use is to be encouraged. The challenge to make adequate provision for preservation is small,

indeed, however, compared to the vastly enhanced social utility of the collections if we are willing to accept the challenge and find ways to meet it.

The development of seminars and other educational programs may be relatively high in psychic cost to staff who see their role as limited exclusively to collecting and preserving archives, but it is low in financial cost. Aside from collection access and meeting space it requires no more than provision for instruction--obviously by someone with experience in archival research--and, where applicable, provision for credits. Our experience at the Newberry suggests that both of these can be accomplished relatively easily by the development of collaborative programs with nearby schools and colleges, or with consortia that represent a number of institutions. We have an extensive program of research seminars and opportunities for independent research for undergraduate college students from the member colleges of the Associated Colleges of the Midwest and the Great Lakes Colleges Association--25 leading liberal arts colleges stretching from Ohio to Colorado. Faculty from the colleges (who must be approved by the Newberry) lead the seminars; credits and fees are arranged by the consortia and the colleges themselves. A less formal arrangement brings advanced graduate students for seminars from the University of Chicago, the University of Illinois, Loyola, and Northwestern, with their institutions providing both instruction and credit. Still another arrangement with a leading independent school in Chicago, soon to be joined by the Chicago Public Schools, brings secondary school students under similar terms. On the drawing board is a similar relationship with the American Indian Higher Education Consortium to bring students from ten Indian colleges in the West to use our great collection in

Indian history and the history of Indian-white Relations. In all these programs we have found the schools and colleges highly cooperative, and eager to work with us. In the case of programs for out-of-city institutions some funding is necessary to meet the difference between costs and tuition income, but the amounts are not exorbitant.

4. The Archive as a Research and Educational Institution. Another panel has discussed the development of the archive as a research institution; that is not the subject of this session, or this paper. The types of projects mentioned may go on independently of any other, and independently of each other. But in fact the development of archives as research and educational institutions may also go hand-in-hand, and lead to the development of new types of institutions that offer a wide scope of new uses for archival and manuscript repositories. The seminars that make the Newberry an educational institution, for example, are all research seminars, based on the Library's collections; otherwise they would have no business at the Newberry. They are closely associated in a variety of ways with three major research centers that we have developed to encourage the use of our collections: the Hermon Dunlap Smith Center for the History of Cartography (which offers fellowships for scholarly research, publishes scholarly monographs in its particular field, sponsors monthly meetings of a Chicago Map Society for lay collectors, and offers courses in map history at the graduate and undergraduate level, and for adults); the Center for the History of the American Indian (which offers Fellowships for academic scholars and for Native American Tribal Historians, publishes bibliographies of Indian history, runs the program for secondary school teachers mentioned above, and is currently engaged in a major research project to prepare an Atlas of Great Lakes Indian History); and

the Family and Community History Center (which offers an intensive summer institute in quantification for historians interested in using new techniques for work in social and community history, offers fellowships, sponsors research projects in Social Mobility and the History of Old Age, and runs a training program for lay people working on the history of their own communities, as well as the program in the teaching of State and Community history mentioned above).

Interns, work-study students, and students working for academic credit in seminars participate in virtually all of these programs. The Centers, in turn, sponsor seminars and colloquia of their own as a way of bringing together the communities of scholars--at all levels--who are working in their respective fields both at the Library and in the greater Chicago area.

Partly by design, and partly by the synergistic effect that these research and educational programs have on one another, we find ourselves developing an institution that is in part a Center for Advanced Studies, in part a Center for Non-traditional Education, and in part a Research and Development Center for the production of scholarly and educational tools. The base for all of these--and what makes them possible--is a great Library collection, including both archival and manuscript collections. Growth of this sort is not without stress and strain for an institution. The research centers, in particular, are expensive; they require a lot of funding. But we have found the combined development to be both exciting and rewarding, and we think in our case that it makes us much better custodians of our collections than we would have been otherwise.

The worlds of education and of research are clearly changing, creating, as they do, opportunities for much wider and different use of traditional institutions. These opportunities will clearly vary from institution to institution. To seize them is a worthy challenge.